19980306.ba v01_n955.bam.980306 v01_n956.bam.980306

>From ???@??? Sat Mar 07 01:56:54 1998
Message-Id: <199803061443.IAA10010@sco.theporch.com>
Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 08:43:01 CST
Subject: BOATANCHORS digest 1955

BOATANCHORS Digest 1955

Topics covered in this issue include:

1) FS Hallicrafters HA-1 TO Keyer
by ARONGV <ARONGV@aol.com>
2) Re: questions about sweeping IF
by Morris Odell <morriso@vifp.monash.edu.au>
3) Puyallup Hamfest Information
by "Jim Hall" <jim_sr@micron.net>
4) Getting well and properly screwed
by "." <rau@wco.com>
5) FS: TM 11-874 (SX-28)
by dave metz <metzd@cfw.com>
6) Got Any???
by Terry Muncey <Terry@electrosys.com>
7) Need 304TL sockets/T-50 mic
by Tom Smith <tsmith@hal-pc.org>
8) low radiation receivers, -or- marketing 101 (long)
by "Lawrence R. Ware" <lrware@pipeline.com>
9) R388 disposition problem
by Gordon Smith <wpe9ijx@iquest.net>
10) Re: R388 disposition problem
by "Arden Allen" <aallen@sirius.com>
11) Re: questions about sweeping IF
by Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
12) Re: Puyallup Hamfest Information
by Terry Burge <terrybu@netman.ENS.TEK.COM>
13) Re: low radiation receivers (verbose)
by Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
14) R390 vs. R390A or something like that
by Terry Burge <terrybu@netman.ENS.TEK.COM>
15) Free: NOS KWM-1 VFO dial
by Ray Mote <rmote@rain.org>
16) Free: Hickock 530B Op Instructions
by Ray Mote <rmote@rain.org>
17) Re: Classes A, B, C
by Bill Jarvis <B.H.Jarvis@hw.ac.uk>
18) 4KP1 CRT by General Electronic (who is?)
by "Claudio Marchesini" <cmar@datamat.it>
19) Re: 4KP1 CRT by General Electronic (who is?)

    by Bill Jarvis <B.H.Jarvis@hw.ac.uk>
 20) UA2AO Kaliningrad
    by "Ragnar Otterstad" <otterstad@inet.uni2.dk>
 21) Re: low radiation receivers
    by Michael Hanz <AAFRadio@erols.com>
 22) Re: R388 disposition problem
    by Joe Eide <jeide@execpc.com>
 23) Re: low radiation receivers, -or- marketing 101 (long)
    by "P. J. Rovero" <provero@connix.com>
 24) Re: R388 disposition problem
    by john <johnmb@mindspring.com>
 25) UPS PROCEDURES
    by aculbert@pps1-po.phyp.uiowa.edu
 26) INFO NEEDED THORDARSON TFS
    by DEE ALMQUIST <w4pnt@rica.net>

Date: Thu, 5 Mar 1998 18:35:20 EST
From: ARONGV <ARONGV@aol.com>
To: baswaplist@foothill.net, boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: FS Hallicrafters HA-1 TO Keyer
Message-ID: <6d657d20.34ff36ba@aol.com>

Hi Gang:

Swap meets coming, so gotta clear out some stuff and find some pocket money for new things I didn't know I wanted.

I have a very nice Hallicrafters HA-1 TO Keyer that's definitely a 9+. Best I've ever seen. $70 shipped.

Untangle those feed lines and run one! Got a Heathkit remote coax switch HD-1481 that's never been used with original manual. $85 shipped. (I have two, but gonna keep one for Spring project)

Finally, have a looks-about-mint Vectronics model PM-30 300/3000 watt power/SWR meter that will switch between peak and average, 1.8 to 60 MHz, and a back lighted meter (you supply the 12 VDC cube) $45 shipped.

Ron W0OIZ

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 12:24:22 +1100
From: Morris Odell <morriso@vifp.monash.edu.au>
To: boatanchors@sco.theporch.com, Ho4bart@aol.com
Subject: Re: questions about sweeping IF

Message-ID: <34FF5046.45CF@vifp.monash.edu.au>

Ho4bart wrote:
>
> Allen Arden's success with sweeping the SX-101's xtal filter
> sounds like mega fun. i am wondering how i can replicate that
> experiment in my own kitchen. at present i have only signal
> generators, freq counter, and lowerend Heath scopes (solid
> state, sweep to about 1 MHz recurrent.) I realize i need a
> triggered (and maybe even delayed trace?) scope to look
> at oscillators and such,

You don't necessarily need a triggered 'scope for this. A year or two ago we had a thread on building up a simple sweeper that would do the job. With a recurrent 'scope you need to get the sawtooth out and use it to control a reactance tube or (wash my mouth out) a varicap in a relatively simple oscillator circuit. In fact you don't really need a timebase at all, you could use a low frequency sinewave as Arden described. The line frequency may be a bit too high for communications receiver IF sweeping. When I was a kid all I had was a very simple 'scope with a gas tube timebase with a jumper between the "timebase out" and "horizontal in" terminals - perfect. You make up a oscillator using a tube and a spare IF transformer and rig the recatance tube across the tuned circuit. For the reactance tube you will need something with a reasonable amount of transconductance such as a 6(S)J7, 6AK5, 6AH6 or 6AC7. Suitable circuits are in most older textbooks. Connect the input of the reactance tube to the sawtooth output from the 'scope.

Connect your sweeper to a suitable point in the receiver ahead of the stage you want to sweep. Disable the AVC and connect the 'scope to the output of the last IF transformer or the detector. The 'scope does NOT have to be fast enough to look at the IF frequency directly - all you need to see is the envelope. Keep the timebase frequency low - 5 Hz or so. With some fiddling you should be able to see a response curve on the screen.

> i see that many TV-service type sweepers start about 3 MHz,
> some higher. let's say i am doing an SX-101. why can't i tune
> the receiver to the sweeper's center frequency,

That's perfectly OK in fact it's what I do at the moment with the gear I have. The pattern you see will of course include the front end selectivity of the receiver but that's usually so wide in comparison to the IF selectivity that it doesn't affect the display.

> i would
> first set the sweepwidth to zero, then tune the receiver to give
> an exact output to the counter and scope, then crank up the

> sweep, but slightly. maybe these TV sweeps just are made for
> a *much* wider sweep, so the 20-40 kHz bandpass we need to
> look at is too tricky to adjust for?

That's pretty well the right procedure, but you might need to dig into the TV sweeper to reduce the sweep range. TV sweepers might sweep at too high a frequency too. For sharp crystal filters you need to keep the sweep rate pretty slow. A high persistence screen helps.

> also, considering a panadaptor, if that is hung at the detector
> output, and then the receiver driven by a sweeping vfo at 455,
> 1650, or whatever the case may be, would that do the same
> thing, essentially?

This is not quite the appropriate use of a panadaptor. You could use one as a sweep-generator-plus-display with suitable modification. A panadaptor contains a sweep oscillator which is offset from the receiver IF by the Panadaptor's IF frequency. If you retuned it to the Rx IF you could use it as an IF sweep oscillator but it's messy.

Good Luck

73 de Morris VK3DOC

Date: Thu, 5 Mar 1998 18:20:53 -0700
From: "Jim Hall" <jim_sr@micron.net>
To: <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Puyallup Hamfest Information
Message-ID: <01bd489e$1b49dca0$2fd186cc@rothead.micron.net>

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

------=_NextPart_000_0006_01BD4863.6EEB04A0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Does anyone have information on the Puyallup Hamfest? I believe it may =
be this Saturday March 7.

Thanks,
Jim W4TVI

------=_NextPart_000_0006_01BD4863.6EEB04A0
Content-Type: text/html;
charset="iso-8859-1"

```
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD W3 HTML//EN">
<HTML>
<HEAD>

<META content=3Dtext/html;charset=3Diso-8859-1 =
http-equiv=3DContent-Type>
<META content=3D'"MSHTML 4.71.1712.3"' name=3DGENERATOR>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Does anyone have information on the =
Puyallup=20
Hamfest?&nbsp; I believe it may be this Saturday March 7.</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2></FONT>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Thanks,</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT color=3D#000000 size=3D2>Jim&nbsp; =
W4TVI</FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>

------=_NextPart_000_0006_01BD4863.6EEB04A0--
```

Date: Thu, 5 Mar 1998 17:46:45 -0800
From: "." <rau@wco.com>
To: <william@ans.net>
Cc: "boatanchors" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Getting well and properly screwed
Message-ID: <199803060150.RAA27048@shell.wco.com>

I have some quart jars filled will mil-spec screws and nuts in the standard sizes

this is about 10 to the 12th power better than anything you can buy at the hardware store

i might package this stuff up.. (remember Poly Paks ?)

have enough groovy good stuf to make a sizable number of " surprise paks" with nice mil spec indicator lamps, tube sockets, folding handles etc.

every pak guaranteed to contain stuff

given some encouragement

Larry W6WUH

Date: Thu, 05 Mar 1998 21:20:57 -0500
From: dave metz <metzd@cfw.com>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: FS: TM 11-874 (SX-28)
Message-ID: <2.2.32.19980306022057.006dd054@milo.cfw.com>

I have an original TM 11-874 for the ANGRR2 (SX28A) 22 Nov 1944 that is in like new condition with all pages tightly intact except for a flaw on the front cover. When I got it, it had one of those 1"x2" white tags on it. Being the idiot of the day, I removed it with a razor blade but managed to cut through it but just slightly. At that point, I quit and left the "flap" just hanging there because didn't know how to fix it properly and that's how it remains-- no hole with just a piece of scotch tape but ready for an expert to fix to his liking. For the above reasons, I don't know what it is worth. To me, its a minor flaw virtually invisible with a piece of good tape. To others it is probably more serious. Given that I no longer have a SX 28, I am sure there is someone who needs it more than me. Offers? (I'll wait till Sat for the benefit of those taking this as a digest)

73's
dave

Date: Thu, 5 Mar 1998 20:45:03 -0600
From: Terry Muncey <Terry@electrosys.com>
To: "'boatanchors@theporch.com'" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Got Any???
Message-ID:
<c=US%a=_ecs%p=ElectroSys%l=WEBMASTER-980306024503Z-139@webmaster.eletrosys.com>

HELP OUT THERE: Looking for . . . .

Complete set of SAMS MHF series (Modular Hi-Fi) books,
Complete set of SAMS TSM series (Transistor radio) books,
Sams Photofacts Sets 1-200, and 800-950.

Also need 2 Sams DC (dial cord books) number 3 and 7, I have the rest.
Consider copies on the DC books.

Anyone got any??

Terry - WB5OAS

Date: Thu, 05 Mar 1998 21:28:02 +0000
From: Tom Smith <tsmith@hal-pc.org>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: Need 304TL sockets/T-50 mic
Message-ID: <34FF18E2.6DEFDD56@hal-pc.org>

Hi BA Gang! I have a few nooks and crannies available to store some "stuff". Yes, I obtained permission from the "war department" to procure this new stuff before posting this mail. It's the pits when you jump the gun and get something before getting the aproval. However, I understand that it's sometimes better to ask for forgiveness than ask for permission.

Still need at least (2) 304TL sockets

Also need a T-50 dynamic mic and or the three pin male Amphenol plug. This was the dynamic mic used with the BC-610 / BC-614. If I can come across the plug, I'll make do with that.

and a 55mfd / 30KV vacuum cap also for the BC-610

Thanks! Tom Smith N5AMA tsmith@hal-pc.org

Date: Thu, 05 Mar 1998 22:29:45 +0000
From: "Lawrence R. Ware" <lrware@pipeline.com>
To: boatanchors@sco.theporch.com
Subject: low radiation receivers, -or- marketing 101 (long)
Message-ID: <3.0.5.32.19980305222945.007fd210@pop.pipeline.com>

Good evening firebottle fans, fanatics, and followers! :-)
Tonight I'd like to start a thread, or perhaps revive an old one, concerning the "Low Radiation" receivers sold to the Navy as they were phasing out older TRF equipment. Our time frame for tonight is the WWII years, and shortly prior.

An editor I'm working with, (who shall remain nameless, because everybody knows what editors are like :-) has objected to something I wrote as part of an article on old Nationals.

Postulated: RF preselectors were installed on many Navy receivers of the era due to the requirements of the RF environment, ie. The need to successfully reject *strong* nearby transmitter signals.

Not, contrary to Mr Scott and Co. to prevent DF'ing of local oscillator
signals by Axis U-boats, etc.

For your amusement, the objectionable section is below...
Your comments, pro and con are solicited. Please sharpen your
blue pencils and let me know what you think.

Because this subject touches on a number of truly boatanchor themes,
including firebottle radios, firebottle RF preselectors,
firebottle transmitters, and firebottle design issues of the time.
Public (listwide) thoughts, commentary, and discussion should
be welcome. If it is not, I'm quite sure I'll hear from Jack
shortly. <grin>

Marshalling published documents to support your opinion and
quoting them (*very* briefly, please!) should be OK.
Control and prevention of Blocking or front end overload in
early firebottle designs should also be very "on-topic."
Me Too posting, and quoting this posting, except *very* briefly
is discouraged. (I'm being plenty long winded enough I think,
thanks! :-)

----------------------- excerpt ------------------------------

Born in the days of WWII the US Navy RAO series of National NC-100A's
have some unique features that make them quite interesting.

All but the quite rare RAO (no suffix) and RAO-1 have an extra RF tuning
stage ganged onto the back of a modified NC-100A chassis.
This extra sub-chassis is attached with a combination of bolts and spot
welds.
<snip>

The extra RF preselector stage common to most RAO's has a lot of
interesting speculation and misinformation surrounding it.
It is commonly believed these preselector stages were added to
many Navy radios to prevent enemy forces from DF'ing (Direction Finding)
the local oscillators in the radios themselves.

The E.H. Scott Radio Company apparently started this with a series of
radios equipped with shielding and preselector circuits for marine use.
I have been told that they advertised the unique features of the radios
in trade journals of the era, suggesting that radios without these
features could get a ship sunk by enemy U-boats!

However, a check of published information reveals no evidence that
Germany or Japan ever claimed a kill based on DF of local oscillator
circuits. They did report kills based on locating convoys and other

shipping from 2-way communications (ship to ship, and ship to shore messages.) And many from the reception of "spotting reports" transmitted from Axis long-range patrol aircraft.

The Navy specifications of the time were very strict in this regard: Several of my RAO series Navy Manuals State that oscillator radiation must be below 400 micro-micro-watts as measured at the antenna terminals! That is less than 400 Pico-Watts of radiated leakage!

I believe that these preselector circuits actually served a much more important, but far less exciting purpose:

Warships, since the dawn of electronic communications have always been an extremely high intensity electromagnetic field environment. This is even truer today than during the years of WWII. But even then multiple transmitters and receivers for all manor of uses had to co-exist without interference to each other.

"Battleship Sailor" by Theodore C. Mason, (Navel Institute Press, 1982) is the non-fictional story of Petty Officer Mason's life as a radioman aboard the battleship California leading up to its sinking during the attack on Pearl Harbor by Japan. While this book has little to say about the specific radios used in warships of the time, it does go into quite a bit of detail about operating procedures, and how the communications systems on a fleet command battleship were used.

Multiple transmitters and receivers were expected to co-exist constantly. In fact the descriptions of radio operations by the books author would be impossible if the on board transmitters were prone to interfere with on board receivers nearby.

When you consider that most if not all of such a warships antennas were in close proximity to each other, the ability of any receiver to reject very strong nearby signals was quite critical!

-------------------- end excerpt ---------------------------------

-Larry

# Larry Ware
# Admirer, Collector, Restorer of National Radio Company
# receivers and other artifacts.
# Orlando, Florida
# lrware@pipeline.com

Date: Thu, 5 Mar 1998 21:53:45 -0600 (CST)
From: Gordon Smith <wpe9ijx@iquest.net>
To: boatanchors@sco.theporch.com
Subject: R388 disposition problem
Message-ID: <199803060353.VAA25429@sco.theporch.com>

Greetings fellow anchorites. I have an R388 receiver courtesy of the USAF MARS program. It has been sitting idle for several years, and it doesn't appreciate the application of 120VAC any more. It can still pull in the local AM broadcast station on a six inch piece of solder, but there's a lot of hum. Anyway, I would
like to rid myself of this Collins receiver (s/n 639), but there is a problem......
As a piece of consigned MARS equipment, I can't sell it. Since I left the MARS program last year (after about 25 years), I don't have a real USAF outlet for it.
The new Indiana state MARS director told me not to worry about going through the red tape to officially return it to the USAF. He told me not to call the people at HQ. So, I guess if I want to be rid of it, and keep to the intent of the regulations, I can part it out a little here, a little there. At least no one will
be able to get the whole radio, fix it up, and sell it.

Before I begin taking requests for parts, I would like to ask if there are any MARS
members on this list who want it. I suppose that would be the easiest way to get
rid of it, and not break too many of the regulations. I am in central Indiana, and
would probably take the easy way out of not wanting to crate it up and ship it to either
coast. If you can supply me with a photocopy of a valid MARS license (USAF gets top
priority :) :)), I'll put your hat in the ring. Send me an email to advise me of your interest. If I don't get any response from a MARS member, I'll post again to the list to see who wants what. I hope that sounds fair to all concerned.

I would have been glad to turn it in at the local regular USAF base, but since it was closed, and is now a reserve base, that is not an option. I have a feeling they just wouldn't want it.

Regards.
W9LU WPE9IJX 1992 BMW K75
Regards from the "Silicon Flood Plain" (tm) of Kokomo, In.
(home of Delco Electronics and the "Steer and the Stump" .....
ask me if you want more info :)) reply to: wpe9ijx@iquest.net

---

Date: Thu, 5 Mar 1998 21:22:54 -0800
From: "Arden Allen" <aallen@sirius.com>
To: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: R388 disposition problem
Message-ID: <199803060521.VAA17018@mail2.sirius.com>

Gee willikers Gordon;

> .....So, I guess if I want to be rid of it, and keep to the intent of the
> regulations, I can part it out a little here, a little there. At least no
> one will be able to get the whole radio, fix it up, and sell it........

Parting out a perfectly repairable radio should be a crime against BAdom,
punishable by life in Jack's penalty box. Sell it to a legitimate
collector for the fair market price. Send a check to the U. S. Treasury.
I hear they take contributions. That's the best deal Uncle Sam can get!

Give your loved ones Gummy Bears.
Arden Allen KB6NAX Vallejo, CA aallen@sirius.com

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 00:32:47 EST
From: Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: Re: questions about sweeping IF
Message-ID: <8ce40cd9.34ff8a81@aol.com>

In a message dated 98-03-05 20:26:06 EST,
morriso@vifp.monash.edu.au writes:

> This is not quite the appropriate use of a panadaptor. You could use one
> as a sweep-generator-plus-display with suitable modification. A
> panadaptor contains a sweep oscillator which is offset from the receiver
> IF by the Panadaptor's IF frequency. If you retuned it to the Rx IF you
> could use it as an IF sweep oscillator but it's messy.
>

---reason i asked about this is i have a panadaptor already, altho with a

small screen. i figgered that as long as the panadaptor already shows
wide and narrow signals, why not use it to show a somewhat wider
signal -- a swept oscillator seen thru the selectivity stage i am working
with.
tnx for your advice. hue

Date: Thu, 05 Mar 1998 22:23:25 PST
From: Terry Burge <terrybu@netman.ENS.TEK.COM>
To: jim_sr@micron.net
Cc: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>, terrybu@netman.ENS.TEK.COM
Subject: Re: Puyallup Hamfest Information
Message-ID: <9803060623.AA17217@netman.ENS.TEK.COM>

Puyallup is this Saturday with doors opening at 9:00AM.
Terry

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 01:23:31 EST
From: Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
To: boatanchors@sco.theporch.com
Subject: Re: low radiation receivers (verbose)
Message-ID: <61b5999.34ff9665@aol.com>

in last summers thread on "df' ing of receiver oscillators" i was one of
the debunkers. to summarize:
at the *outset* of WW2 commercial vessels still had on board some
really outmoded equipment. spark transmitters and 2-tube receivers.
in the first months of the war, in 1941 in the US, and probably back
to 1939 for the UK, this equipment was changed out for better, but
sometimes just slightly less outmoded equipment. for example,
Alaska Steamship company in dec/ jan 1941 changed out their
WW1 Navy longwave receivers still on some vessels for this --
the National SW-3, a regen, but one with an RF stage!   i have an
example of a UK ship receiver, built in 1940, that is after the start
of the submarine war - and it is a regen, with 4 tubes, but it *does*
have an RF stage, so you could say it was safe to procede with.
as has been noted a couple times, there were rare occasions where
an astute radioman noticed and managed to recognize the steady
carrier of a regenerative receiver parked on the 500-kc/s distress
frequency which was constantly monitored, at maybe up to 20 miles.
these signals were IMO only possible from a regen receiver of the
type where the antenna goes right into the detector. so if you have,
what 100 volts on the plate, at a couple mA, you have a small
transmitter connected to a big antenna. but put an RF stage in front

of the detector and see far you can hear it, on the best receiver, and you will measure the dx in *feet* (or maybe, meters...).

german submariner accounts both wartime and postwar however fail to recount one single incident of such used as a 'hunting spoor'; even if one argues that this was a 'classified technique', this would not account for its nonappearance in any post-war account. in fact, the *only* postwar reference to df-ing the prey (that i have seen) was a statement that U-boats *tried* to df the 2- mc/s band listening for ship traffic, but this effort was for naught as there was *no traffic* in this band at sea. radio silence was maintained, except for distress calls; routine traffic was by blinker light or TBS and TBY (yes the 'walkie talkie'; this had an outside groundplane antenna for 72 mc/s region and an optional 110-volt AC supply if the ship had generator for that.) on the other hand, there are several accounts of U-boats listening for distress calls on the "600 metre wave" (500 kc/s), for discovering the whereabouts of convoys. also it's a fact that U-boats carried an auxiliary / shore party set the R3 / RS20 (also apparently used by agents in NA), of which the receiver R3 *would* *not* have met the standards set by the US authority for "radiation-safe" levels, based on the sets rejected and the modifications mandated for others.

so, did the U-boat authority believe in this same method of finding vessels by their receiver radiation? apparently *not* !

i do not think this was mostly a marketing feature, altho i do believe once the manufacturers jumped on the bandwagon, they were not particularly interesting in having the myth dispelled. those special receivers they sold the government were *expensive*, and IMO, for entertainment use, maybe overbuilt. yes, in a shipboard environ, you wouldn't want them interfering with othere reeceivers, so you would want a shielded receiver with very low radiation, but you wouldn't necessarily need it to be bulletproof, or built to last 500 years.

one respondent to last summer's thread intimated that secret equipment used by the government is capable of exeptional df-ing of radio receivers. i am unconvinced that is relevant to this situation, even tho US equipment used in the VietNam war was able to df trucks on the HoChiMinh trail by picking up ignition spark signals, i say df-ing at vhf-uhf frequencies, with modern equipment, *from* *aircraft* is a lot different from trying to df low frequency, single carrier signals - which *may* or *may not* exist, depending on equipment vagaries -- at sea level.

with the shocking levels of shipping losses at the outset of WW2, even within sight of land from the US coast, no doubt explanations needed to be developed, fast. spying was one, and maybe some truth to it; secret direction-finding by submarines was another speculation, and as we now know, a bogus issue; while the simple truth was that is was just unpreparedness: lack of advanced counter

submarine weapons, and not having coherent procedures in place.
hue miller

Date: Thu, 05 Mar 1998 22:44:38 PST
From: Terry Burge <terrybu@netman.ENS.TEK.COM>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Cc: terrybu@netman.ENS.TEK.COM
Subject: R390 vs. R390A or something like that
Message-ID: <9803060644.AA17306@netman.ENS.TEK.COM>

I suppose we're about sick of this thread but I did say I post just what my lil' -390 is so here it is:

Front panel plate says,
Signal Corps   U.S.Army
Radio Receiver R-390/URR
Serial No. 1882 Order 14214-PH-51-93
Collins Radio Company
500 KC to 32 MC

Having started reading the TM 11-856 TO 31R1-2URR-154 manual copy I quickly figured out I should move my R42 speaker from pins 10-13 to 6-7 local audio. Made a BIG difference in how well the radio worked. Hearing alot more stations now and it works fair on 20 meters SSB too. The quad helped there too.

Pinout on the back with jumpers I'm not quite sure about one thing yet, why the 680 ohm resistor between 10 and 13? Here is what it has:

1 jumpered to 2 RF gain
3 jumpered to 4 AGC NORmal
5 open DIV
6 and 7 speark Local Audio
8 PHNS opne

9 Break In open
10 to 13 with a 680 ohm resistor?
11 jumpered to 12
14 jumpered to 15 Diode Load
16 GND (need to hook it up

There is a missing lable just below the main signal corps

one, very thin that I'm not sure what it is suppose to be.
Whoever said those 6082 get hot wasn't kidding! Need to get a
fan setup for them. All told the radio seems to work pretty good
just the way it came except for a little cleaning needed on the MC
switch contacts.

Terry
PS: leaving tomarrow for Puyallup Hamfest and going to checked the
antique stores too.

Date: Thu, 5 Mar 1998 23:36:09 -0800 (PST)
From: Ray Mote <rmote@rain.org>
To: Boatanchors <boatanchors@sco.theporch.com>
Subject: Free: NOS KWM-1 VFO dial
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.96.980305233438.12445A-100000@coyote.rain.org>

Collins p/n: 542-5404-002 according to the slip of paper in the
envelope. Would like to see it go to a KWM-1 that badly needs it.
Rules of Ware apply. :-)

Ray Mote, K5FKT <rmote@rain.org> Oxnard, CA

Date: Thu, 5 Mar 1998 23:38:16 -0800 (PST)
From: Ray Mote <rmote@rain.org>
To: Boatanchors <boatanchors@sco.theporch.com>
Subject: Free: Hickock 530B Op Instructions
Message-ID: <Pine.SUN.3.96.980305233612.12445B-100000@coyote.rain.org>

Marked for S/N: 576418. Includes schematic & ballast tube test charts.
Rules of Ware apply. :-)

Ray Mote, K5FKT <rmote@rain.org> Oxnard, CA

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 09:10:09 +2400
From: Bill Jarvis <B.H.Jarvis@hw.ac.uk>
To: vancleef <vancleef@netcom.com>

Cc: boatanchors <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: Classes A, B, C
Message-ID: <199803060910.JAA08084@punt1.hw.ac.uk>

Thanks for the help over that, OM. When I was at school (around '55) people in the valve manufacturing industry seemed to measure electron transit time in jiffies: the time for an electron to travel one centimetre. Pity that one seems to have got shelved - it's useful!

(It also made good Advanced Level Physics exam questions.)

UN de Bill

Bill
GM8APX, qthr=No 6, EH4 6JY==No Rectangulars=Cave Felem==Ikke Hawkering

Cantabit vacuus coram latrone viator

Net-Tamer V 1.10 - Registered

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 10:22:26 +0100
From: "Claudio Marchesini" <cmar@datamat.it>
To: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: 4KP1 CRT by General Electronic (who is?)
Message-ID: <01bd48e1$60ae0260$260b020a@cmar.datamat.it>

Hi Gang,
I need some help about a cathode ray tube named 4KP1.
The 4KP1 is a wonderful CRT I'd like to use for panorama adaptor.
I think was made by General Electronic (who is?).
The logo is not perfectly readable because the label is damaged.

I need some info about pin-out, maximum HV, heater voltage, etc.

Thank you & best 73.

Claudio
BA collector in Italy

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 10:26:43 +2400
From: Bill Jarvis <B.H.Jarvis@hw.ac.uk>
To: cmar <cmar@datamat.it>

Cc: boatanchors <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: 4KP1 CRT by General Electronic (who is?)
Message-ID: <199803061026.KAA09166@punt1.hw.ac.uk>

On 1998-03-06 cmar@datamat.it said:
 cm>Status:
 cm>Hi Gang,
 cm>I need some help about a cathode ray tube named 4KP1.
 cm>The 4KP1 is a wonderful CRT I'd like to use for panorama adaptor.
 cm>I think was made by General Electronic (who is?).
 cm>The logo is not perfectly readable because the label is damaged.
 cm>I need some info about pin-out, maximum HV, heater voltage, etc.
 cm>Thank you & best 73.
 cm>Claudio
 cm>BA collector in Italy

My 1961 Equivalents List doesn't mention it but it has several --KP-, for example 14KP4. It says they were made by Emitron. That's Electrical and Musical Industries as was. They don't go under that name now but Thorn comes into the present name. I doubt whether such a Company would be interested in helping, nowadays, because of the cost of time - but SOME do!

I shall look for their website and ask; back by return if successful.

UN de Bill

Bill
GM8APX, qthr=No 6, EH4 6JY==No Rectangulars=Cave Felem==Ikke Hawkering

Forsan et haec olim meminisse juvabit

Net-Tamer V 1.10 - Registered

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 12:30:39 +0100
From: "Ragnar Otterstad" <otterstad@inet.uni2.dk>
To: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: UA2AO Kaliningrad
Message-ID: <199803061126.MAA04647@inet.uni2.dk>

Quite a few expressed their sympathy and interest for UA2AO and his restauration of US made WW2 radios as shown in QST. (I have not yet received nr 3 /98)

As I just have received letter from Anatoly yesterday I thought I would
share some of it¥s content with this reflector:
His prime interest is WW2 US comm.gear supplied by Britain/USA. He has
found and restored AR88,SX28,HRO,NC200 and a string of BC 312/314/342.
He is looking for BC 348 with sufixes K.L and R, name plates for BC
342-N,BC312-D, and power supply chassis connectors(for 3 receivers) ,
connector SO-1 and cover part No 29.
Also needs TM 11-850-N.''

If any on this reflector wants to donate anything of the above to Anatoly,
there is a German ham who goes to Kaliningrad this spring and he is willing
to bring parts with him to UA2AO.

Drop me a note if you have something.

73 Rag OZ8RO in Copenhagen

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 07:27:20 -0800
From: Michael Hanz <AAFRadio@erols.com>
To: lrware@pipeline.com
Cc: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: low radiation receivers
Message-ID: <350015D8.5429@erols.com>

Lawrence R. Ware wrote:
> Postulated: RF preselectors were installed on many Navy receivers
> of the era due to the requirements of the RF environment, ie. The need
> to successfully reject *strong* nearby transmitter signals.

That makes some sense to me, though I always get a prickly feeling when
"what they really were trying to do" gets mentioned without
documentation from the original designers. Not saying it's a bad
postulate (for that particular receiver), just that the jury may still
be out. It sort of falls apart when you look at some of the airborne
ELINT receivers of the era, like the Halli AN/ARR-5 and AN/ARR-7. I
think they were also occasionally used aboard some ships due to their
compact designs - subs come to mind. There's not a much more hostile
EMI environment than in an aircraft, and yet the antiradiation stages in
both receivers have wide open front ends, just a single stage added to
the front of the same antenna coils used on the SX-28 and S-27
predecessors. If anything, the antirad stage makes the dynamic range
problem much worse!

On the other hand, who's to say you're wrong? Not me!

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 06:46:23 -0600
From: Joe Eide <jeide@execpc.com>
To: wpe9ijx@iquest.net
Cc: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: Re: R388 disposition problem
Message-ID: <34FFF01F.723D@execpc.com>

Hi Gordon,

Please don't part out the radio if it is in good physical condition! I have a hard time believing that solution is the only one.
It would be much better to put it in a good home for another 15 or 20 years and it would surely be forgotten by then.

73 & good luck with your decision. Joe - KB9R

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 08:13:26 -0500 (EST)
From: "P. J. Rovero" <provero@connix.com>
To: "Lawrence R. Ware" <lrware@pipeline.com>
Cc: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: low radiation receivers, -or- marketing 101 (long)
Message-ID: <Pine.BSI.3.95.980306081142.29850A-100000@comet.connix.com>

Actually, with the larger ships having many tens of receivers operating off common/distributed antenna systems, they may have been just as concerned with LO leakage from receivers interfering with other RECEIVERS.

IMHO....

```
P. J. "Josh" Rovero         email: provero@connix.com
Oceanographer               work:  rovero@sonalysts.com
Meteorologist               radio: KK1D
Curmudgeon at Large         web:   http://www.connix.com/~provero/
```

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 08:35:09 -0500
From: john <johnmb@mindspring.com>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com

Subject: Re: R388 disposition problem
Message-ID: <199803061335.IAA15964@camel7.mindspring.com>

Please dont part out a wonderful radio just to satisfy a faceless bureacracy. If DOD had this radio back they'd probably just throw it in a dumpster!
/John

At 09:53 PM 3/5/98 -0600, you wrote:
>Greetings fellow anchorites. I have an R388 receiver courtesy of the USAF MARS
>program. It has been sitting idle for several years, and it doesn't appreciate
>the application of 120VAC any more.

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 98 08:25 CST
From: aculbert@pps1-po.phyp.uiowa.edu
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: UPS PROCEDURES
Message-ID: <199803061430.IAA10894@cc-gate.uiowa.edu>

Fellow BAers,

While at the local UPS office last night to ship some BAs (a Drake 4-C line) to a friend in W6 land, the clerk casually mentioned that effective April 1, that UPS will require a special declaration for ALL electronic gear.

I was given a sample copy and it is titled "COMPUTER EQUIPMENT SHIPPING RECORD" and is blue in color and the same form size as their multiple shipping form.

I made some remark about the form being for "computer equipment" and the reply was that it would be required for ALL electronic equipment.

Has any one else heard of this new policy?

Al, K0AL

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 08:41:23 -0600 (CST)
From: DEE ALMQUIST <w4pnt@rica.net>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: INFO NEEDED THORDARSON TFS
Message-ID: <199803061441.IAA09776@sco.theporch.com>

Hi Folks
I feel one of you fine folks has Thordarson transf. data & specs on your shelf. Can someone share with me specs (Z input/output & mabe suggested bottles to use, freq response, distortion, etc.) for the following:

        T-11M75 Multimatch modulation Tf (75 Watt audio)
        T-21M65   "   "   " (300-500 watt audio..??)

Also is there a place on the web that has all info for UTC, Thordarson, & others?

The one Tf T-21M65 was found by a friend and came with a bunch of Tfs & can be cleaned up & I hope used in restoring a '40s transmitter using pr 304TLs finals in PP.
Any help would be appreciated....
73
Dee
Patty, KA4EKK & Dee, W4PNT

Patty and Dee's Marina, collectors of Drake, Johnson, Collins, RCA, Hammarlund, homebrew and other heavy metal. ALL HOBBY....WE'RE RETIRED!

(540)249-3161 Fax: (540) 249-5064
Patty & Dee Almquist
534 W. Main St. Waynesboro, Va. 22980

End of BOATANCHORS Digest 1955
****

>From ???@??? Sat Mar 07 01:58:13 1998
Message-Id: <199803070040.SAA25051@sco.theporch.com>
Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 18:40:03 CST
Subject: BOATANCHORS digest 1956

BOATANCHORS Digest 1956

Topics covered in this issue include:

1) BIG Modulator
   by TIMOTHY.P.HAAKE@monsanto.com
2) Puyallup Hamfest
   by PLT1032 <PLT1032@aol.com>
3) Re: low radiation receivers
   by Henry van Cleef <vancleef@netcom.com>
4) Re: low radiation receivers
   by "A. B. Bonds" <ab@vuse.vanderbilt.edu>

 5) 600 ohm transformers
    by Bill Riches <richesb@algorithms.com>
 6) Re: Getting well and properly screwed
    by William Donzelli <william@ans.net>
 7) RE: 6AK5 SUB FOR 6CB6?
    by JOHN_SEHRING.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN SEHRING)
 8) SX-111
    by JOHN_SEHRING.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN SEHRING)
 9) 6AK6 SUB FOR 6CB6?
    by JOHN_SEHRING.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN SEHRING)
10) Halli S-120...
    by Ken Gordon <keng@uidaho.edu>
11) Re: low radiation receivers
    by Jerry Proc <jproc@idirect.com>
12) Hmmm. Looks like IERC is still around!
    by Tom Norris <badger@telalink.net>
13) WTD: BC-1066-B
    by Lenox Carruth <carruth@swbell.net>
14) R390A filter
    by "Freeberg, Scott (STP)" <scott.freeberg@guidant.com>
15) IERC-Link
    by john <johnmb@mindspring.com>
16) NEED HQ-180 BFO TF
    by DEE ALMQUIST <w4pnt@rica.net>
17) WWVB receiver
    by WILLIAM HAWKINS <bill@iaxs.net>
18) FT/FS: SR-210M
    by Sandy W5TVW <ebjr@worldnet.att.net>
19) Re: low radiation receivers
    by Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
20) 1750 meters again...
    by Sandy W5TVW <ebjr@worldnet.att.net>
21) Re: low radiation receivers
    by Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
22) Re: low radiation receivers
    by Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
23) [Fwd: low radiation receivers]
    by Scott Robinson <spr@earthlink.net>
24) Digital Display For Any Receiver
    by Ron or Wendy Hankins <rh8421@gate.net>
25) Re: [Fwd: low radiation receivers]
    by Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
26) WTB CV-57
    by WILLIAM HAWKINS <bill@iaxs.net>
27) WTB Power Resistors
    by Larry Boyle <lbkd6wi@jps.net>
28) Re: Hmmm. Looks like IERC is still around!
    by Jeffrey Herman <jeffreyh@hawaii.edu>

```
 29) Still looking for teedee
     by "Paul Bernhard Sr." <w2tu@email.msn.com>
 30) Re: Hmmm. Looks like IERC is still around!
     by Ken Gordon <keng@uidaho.edu>
```

```
Date: 06 Mar 1998 08:46:41 -0600
From: TIMOTHY.P.HAAKE@monsanto.com
To: boatanchors@sco.theporch.com
Subject: BIG Modulator
Message-ID: <"0306144759-BIG Modulator"@MHS>
```

Boatmen & women,

Does anyone have any interest in a 1KW modulator? I have alot of goodies that I am planning to bring to Dayton and not a large enough truck.

Run down.... Home brew pair of 304TL's, 1KW Motorola mod xmfr with reactor, power supply, speech preamp, cabinet.

Letmeknow...

Tim WA0TSY
Timothy.P.Haake@Monsanto.com

```
Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 10:00:04 EST
From: PLT1032 <PLT1032@aol.com>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: Puyallup Hamfest
Message-ID: <d28fd137.35000f76@aol.com>
```

I arrived in Seattle for the weekend and heard hamfest mentioned. Can anyone give me times and location in Puyallup?

Bob

```
Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 08:44:06 -0700 (MST)
From: Henry van Cleef <vancleef@netcom.com>
To: lrware@pipeline.com
```

Cc: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: Re: low radiation receivers
Message-ID: <199803061544.HAA21526@netcom6.netcom.com>

I think that the spec is clear: don't let any radiation come out of the antenna leads. The Scott SLR series were supposed to be "Super Low Radiation" although I am not sure that designation was official. However, post WW-II Navy nomenclature used SLR for surface ship countermeasures receivers, and BLR for submarine countermeasures receivers. The Scott SLR's were generally called "morale" receivers and claimed intended use was listening to broadcast stations for entertainment purposes.

I think if I were the editor on this article, I would suggest that you note that the spec for low radiation existed, and then make a good story out of it, unless you can actually find some hard core documentation in Navy material that specifically gives a rationale. That is, I guess, the Ph.D. view of how to handle it. You have the spec, and that is pretty specific---don't let more than picowatts come out of the antenna leads, and present measurements showing this as part of acceptance tests for delivery.

Now, why would the Navy impose such a spec, and require manufacturers to put additional hardware in the set to meet it? You can comment on the various myths, stories, and tales that abound on the topic, but unless you can cite, chapter and verse, some very credible source, such as a Navy document or definite testimony from someone involved, you are stuck having to consider all of these rationales to be unverified myths. Have some fun with that!

I don't think you have to go too far in popular literature to find the belief that German technology was capable of doing lots of things that it was either not capable of doing, or never used to do. Don't forget that one of the enduring myths about WWII was that the British radar net was a technology that the Germans (and Japanese) didn't have, didn't know about, etc. etc. That myth has long since been debunked. Also, it's pretty well known now that the Germans were real radio babble-mouths and that the code-breakers at Bletchley cracked a lot of the Enigma-coded traffic. Also, that the whole U-boat war was coordinated by HF radio from Germany, with tons of radio communications available for countermeasures detection----the HF-DF program was just part of this. You can speculate on some of the rationales for the low radiation spec, without claiming that any of them are "true" or that any of them are "false."

The idea that the U-boats had (and used) countermeasures receivers looking for US radio local oscillator radiation does not seem incredible to me in the context of WW-II era popular notions. Don't forget that this was the era that included the Japanese-American West Coast resettlements, disconnecting SW capability in home entertainment receivers owned by resident aliens in the US, scrap metal drives, and a whole lot of things that, 50 years later, seem totally absurd, and a few of which are ugly things in US history.

You can, of course, note that there are solid engineering rationales for wanting to suppress LO radiation in the shipboard environments. Go ahead and discuss those rationales.

There is a real need for good scholarship in developing history of this type. There is entirely too much "pop" history out there that makes wild claims without supporting them---often very debunkable claims to anyone who spends an hour or two in a good research library and who knows where to look. Put down what you can document with solid citations, and then speculate on ALL the possibilities. That sets the stage for someone else to do the legwork and chase down the rationales through historical sources. It's likely that there were several rationales for this spec, so that claiming that any one is true, and the others are false, isn't the right view to have. You've got a good story here, tell the whole thing.

--
==
Hank van Cleef
==

Date: 06 Mar 1998 10:08:21 -0600
From: "A. B. Bonds" <ab@vuse.vanderbilt.edu>
To: boatanchors@sco.theporch.com
Subject: Re: low radiation receivers
Message-ID: <1998Mar06.100822-0600@spike.vuse.vanderbilt.edu>

In <61b5999.34ff9665@aol.com>, Ho4bart wrote:
>one respondent to last summer's thread intimated that secret
>equipment used by the government is capable of exeptional
>df-ing of radio receivers. i am unconvinced that is relevant to
>this situation, even tho US equipment used in the VietNam war
>was able to df trucks on the HoChiMinh trail by picking up
>ignition spark signals, i say df-ing at vhf-uhf frequencies, with
>modern equipment, *from* *aircraft* is a lot different from
>trying to df low frequency, single carrier signals - which *may*
>or *may not* exist, depending on equipment vagaries -- at sea
>level.

I agree that it is not related to the sinking of convoy ships in WW2, but the book "Spycatcher" describes in detail the counter-espionage effort of the British in the 50's and 60's, which were based strongly on detection of receiver activity. Most of this was at lower frequencies and ground level, single-carrier signals. At least by the description, the strategy was effective. The book is a smashing good read, especially for BA afficionados.

A. B. Bonds

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 11:27:10 -0500
From: Bill Riches <richesb@algorithms.com>
To: r-390@qth.net
Cc: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: 600 ohm transformers
Message-ID: <350023DE.68E4@algorithms.com>

Greetings all,

I have been using Soundolier HT87 70 volt line transformers for years for my 600 ohm receiver output to 4 ohm speaker load.

Transformer Specs
Soundolier HT87
+/- 1 db 50 hz to 15 khz
.6 db insertion loss
Primary taps 1,2,4,8 watts (8 watt tap = 624 ohms - fine match for 500 - 600 ohm radio.)
Secondary taps 4 & 8 ohms
6 inch leads on primary and secondary
1.2 pounds

I am a sound system contractor and can supply these transformers for $20.00 shipped in conus.

73,

Bill Riches, WA2DVU
Cape May, NJ

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 12:37:37 -0500 (EST)
From: William Donzelli <william@ans.net>
To: boatanchors <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: Getting well and properly screwed

Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.3.96.980306123459.12309H-100000@titan.purch.ans.net>

> this is about 10 to the 12th power better than anything you can buy at the
> hardware store

Thank you for all that gave me pointers.

It looks like the old nickel plated brass machine screw is a thing of the
past now. All of the places I checked have plenty of types in many kinds
of materials, but not what I need.

It looks like I might have to go with nickel plated steel after all.

William Donzelli
william@ans.net

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 12:52:35 -0500 (EST)
From: JOHN_SEHRING.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN SEHRING)
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: RE: 6AK5 SUB FOR 6CB6?
Message-ID: <9803061252.aa15817@pcusa01.ecunet.org>

 > > JOHN SEHRING wrote:
 > >The Halli S-76 is red-hot in senstivity all the way up to 30 MHz. And
 > yes, >use a 6CB6 in the RF amp just like it says!

 > I got that impression using the set, although I think my creaky old
 > Hammarlunds (e.g., HQ140) give it a good run for its money, especially
 > at the high end.

I'm surprised. With an S-76 you can easily hear antenna noise on 10 m with
almost any piece of wire.

 > >Its major problem is mechanical stability & some HF osc pulling above
 > about >26 MHz.
 > >
 > There is that. I can set up a beat frequency and modulate it by
 > walking across the floor.
 >

I put mine on a sturdy table! I've also installed some extra chassis
stiffeners & brackets.

 > The other problem that I have run across is that tuning SSB is a bear.
 > Since the BFO is running at a relatively low frequency (50 kHz), it
 > has a fairly narrow range, I don't think it goes more than about a
 > kHz either way. Usually I can find an SSB signal with the BFO

> centered and then choose the sideband with the BFO knob. With this
> puppy I have to hunt for the right place with the bandspread.

The range is plus/minus 2.5 kHz.

That's exactly the right technique--tune to center the sideband (0.3 to 3 kkHz, about 2.7 kHz wide) & adjust the BFO to plus/minus half of 2.7 kHz or 1.35 kHz. to select the sideband. That's the way the Halli SX-122 (the very last of this dual-conversion, general coverage line) does it. The selectable sideband feature which appeared on the SX-96 and found on SX-100, -101, -101A, & -115, was deleted on the SX-122 to save money. With a tunable BFO it's not really needed, it was just a convenience.

>Know that the S-76, SX-96 & SX-100 are almost identical in the RF, mixer &
>IF stages. And very much the same IF circuit was used in the SX-101 &
>-101A, yes, even unto the SX-115.

> And a relative of it even made it into the SX-88 (well, there are a
> few more stages... but that 6CB6 is right up front).

The SX-88 precedes them. It's circuit's concept is somewhat similar but the execution was quite different--the S-76 & later worked better with far fewer tubes, smaller package (I know, we like 'em big) & at much lower cost.

> Thanks for your comments & 73, A. B.

Welcome!

-John Sehring (written on Thu, Mar 5, 1998 at Custer, SD) UCC WB2EQG

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 12:52:39 -0500 (EST)
From: JOHN_SEHRING.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN SEHRING)
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: SX-111
Message-ID: <9803061252.aa15884@pcusa01.ecunet.org>

> Conventional wisdom/folklore has it that some SX-111s had diode
> detectors for CW/SSB while others had product detectors.
>
> Expiring minds want to know...

As far as I know, all SX-111's had both an envelope & product detectors.

The SX-111 was a less expensive follow-up to the SX-101A which did have a product detector. It was smaller, lighter, had 2 fewer bands than the -101A. SSB was firmly in use at this time.

1963 Halli adds for -111 clearly state "product detector". However, my -111 schematic (a copy) has a cryptic hand-written note that says "Not in SX-111" right above the 6BY6 product detector. Hmmm. Anyone?

-John Sehring (written on Thu, Mar 5, 1998 at Custer, SD) UCC WB2EQG

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 12:52:37 -0500 (EST)
From: JOHN_SEHRING.parti@ecunet.org (JOHN SEHRING)
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: 6AK6 SUB FOR 6CB6?
Message-ID: <9803061252.aa15852@pcusa01.ecunet.org>

> I have an SX-73 (R-274) which works great. However I get broadcast band signals bleeding over into the 3-7Mhz range. The receiver uses two RF stages, a 6AG5 followed by a 6BA6. Nothing unusual there. I do have a broadcast station (1580Khz) about 2 miles away, but with 455Khz and 6Mhz IF (works above 7Mhz), signals shouldn't be leaking in that way. Short of building a trap, anything else you might look for?

How far away are Bdcst staions? Power? How many? Might you be hearing harmonics of them at 2F, 3F, etc.? Probs in lower freq range, what's next below 3-7 range?

How well does it do on really strong stations, i.e. is AGC working perfectly or does it overload?

2 RF stages are a bummer, they overload much too easily, problem also seen in SP-600, NC-183D, etc. 6AG5 is not such a good tube in this app (it's a sharp-cutoff pentode, 6BA6 is better (remote-cutoff pentode)), so 6AG5 is less responsive to AGC control & can more easily cross modulate. Make very sure it's not gassy or very weak, that might cause a problem too.

Halli wanted max sensitivity (& image rejection, yes I know it's double conversion but they weren't totally confident--2 RF's is a holdover from the single-conversion days) esp. above 14 MHz & didn't ever consider the RF clutter of today.

-John Sehring (written on Thu, Mar 5, 1998 at Custer, SD) UCC WB2EQG

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 10:08:51 -0800 (PST)
From: Ken Gordon <keng@uidaho.edu>
To: boatanchors@sco.theporch.com
Subject: Halli S-120...

Message-ID: <Pine.BSF.3.95.980306100722.16425H-100000@piobaire.mines.uidaho.edu>

My brother just sent me one of the above. Anyone know where I can get a schematic or manual on this thing?

It sure looks like a repackaged S-38 to me.

Is it?

Ken W7EKB

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 13:15:49 -0800
From: Jerry Proc <jproc@idirect.com>
To: vancleef@netcom.com
Cc: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: low radiation receivers
Message-ID: <35006785.2E23@idirect.com>

> Also, that the whole U-boat war was
> coordinated by HF radio from Germany, with tons of radio
> communications available for countermeasures detection----the HF-DF
> program was just part of this.

To add to Hank's comments:

At the height of the U-boat war, the radio traffic between German HQ and the U-boats reached an incredible 2,500 messages per day!

--

Regards,
Jerry Proc VE3FAB
jproc@idirect.com
HMCS HAIDA Naval Museum, Toronto Ont.

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 12:57:47 -0600
From: Tom Norris <badger@telalink.net>
To: (Recipient list suppressed)
Subject: Hmmm. Looks like IERC is still around!
Message-ID: <3.0.5.32.19980306125747.009b2100@mail1.telalink.net>

Opening up a dead server at work yesterday and extracting

its dead CPU, it noticed some lettering on the large heatsink
attached to same. Closer inspection revealed the letters -
"IERC" (model P54503CB fwiw)

So is IERC still in business? Not that they would still be
offering tube shields...... Anyone have any contact info?

Speaking of which, I really need to write off to Fair and get
a few IERC shields from them while they still have them.
Wonder if they would make a difference in the R-392???

73

Tom KA4RKT

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 13:19:01 -0600
From: Lenox Carruth <carruth@swbell.net>
To: "Boat Anchors List (to submit a listing)" <boatanchors@sco.theporch.com>,
BA Swap List <baswaplist@foothill.net>
Subject: WTD: BC-1066-B
Message-ID: <35004C25.7B8D@swbell.net>

Greetings All:

I happen to have two I-196 Signal Generators which were used with the
BC-1066 Radio Receiver for testing the SCR-595. I would like to have
one less I-196 and have a BC-1066-B in its place so I would have the
complete set. (Yes, I know I don't have the BC-906 Frequency Meter but
I can live with that for the moment! ;>}   )

Anybody for a trade?

--

Lenox

Lenox Carruth, Jr.   carruth@swbell.net
Dallas, Texas
Collector of WW-II Communications Equipment and Memorabilia

Wanted: TCS-14 Transmitter, TBX, BD-71, Sextant

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 13:21:49 -0600
From: "Freeberg, Scott (STP)" <scott.freeberg@guidant.com>
To: "'Boatanchors@theporch'" <boatanchors@sco.theporch.com>
Subject: R390A filter
Message-ID: <21B46CBD022AD1118F0500805F15A0684509A1@STPMSX05.stp.guidant.com>

Hi,

I am trying to identify a Collins mechanical filter (from an R390A I have been told). It has solder terminals on both ends, and a mounting flange with screw holes on one end. It is marked:

Collins Mechanical Filter
F455N-20
R W2
P/N 526 9163 009

>From a Collins website which has detailed mech filter info, this one was not listed, but from looking at the way the number relates to others on that list, this appears to be a 2 Khz filter.

Any information?

Does it have any value? I ask because I would rather have a 6 Khz am filter for a 75A4.

Thanks,

Scott WA9WFA Saint Paul Minn
scott.freeberg@guidant.com

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 14:22:15 -0500
From: john <johnmb@mindspring.com>
To: badger@telalink.net, boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: IERC-Link
Message-ID: <199803061922.OAA22327@camel8.mindspring.com>

www.iercdya.com would get ya started!
/John

At 12:57 PM 3/6/98 -0600, you wrote:

>Opening up a dead server at work yesterday and extracting
>its dead CPU, it noticed some lettering on the large heatsink
>attached to same. Closer inspection revealed the letters -
>"IERC" (model P54503CB fwiw)
>
>So is IERC still in business? Not that they would still be
>offering tube shields...... Anyone have any contact info?
>
>
>Speaking of which, I really need to write off to Fair and get
>a few IERC shields from them while they still have them.
>Wonder if they would make a difference in the R-392???
>
>73
>
>Tom KA4RKT
>
>

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 13:28:24 -0600 (CST)
From: DEE ALMQUIST <w4pnt@rica.net>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: NEED HQ-180 BFO TF
Message-ID: <199803061928.NAA16710@sco.theporch.com>

Hi Folks
Well, I'm somewhat in trouble. I have a broken BFO form & split slug.
Anybody have a parts rig (HQ-180) that might be willing to turn loose of the
BFO Tf? This is T-28 & the fact # is K-42005-4. Any help would be appreciated.
73
Dee
Patty, KA4EKK & Dee, W4PNT

Patty and Dee's Marina, collectors of Drake, Johnson, Collins, RCA,
Hammarlund, homebrew and other heavy metal. ALL HOBBY....WE'RE RETIRED!

(540)249-3161 Fax: (540) 249-5064
Patty & Dee Almquist
534 W. Main St. Waynesboro, Va. 22980

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 13:54:13 -0600 (CST)

From: WILLIAM HAWKINS <bill@iaxs.net>
To: boatanchors@sco.theporch.com
Subject: WWVB receiver
Message-ID: <199803061954.NAA29404@citrus.iaxs.net>

I've got some frequency standards that are good enough to need the 60 KC version of WWV to check them out - or wait a year and compare the standard driven clock against WWV time announcements. They're available in solid state, but I'd like to buy or build a tube version. Seems like a three stage TRF (fixed tuned) would do it. Don't have a shop to make holes in blank chassis, so I'd like to get a chassis that could be modified for this purpose. A receiver with a 50 KC IF would be ideal. Octal or miniature sockets are OK. Rack mount is a plus. No, there's nothing in my collection that I want to tear up. I get to 1 or 2 hamfests a year, so not much opportunity to pick something up that way. Want transformer power (not AA5). Pay $20 and up, depending on condition and fit.

Regards,
Bill Hawkins bill@iaxs.net Mpls, MN 55438-1844

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 20:35:53 +0000
From: Sandy W5TVW <ebjr@worldnet.att.net>
To: BASWAPLIST@FOOTHILL.NET, boatanchors@theporch.com,
        glowbugs@piobaire.mines.uidaho.edu
Subject: FT/FS: SR-210M
Message-ID: <19980306203551.AAA23768@LOCALNAME>

I have an item that is semi solid state, semi vacuum tubes. It is certainly a boat anchor!

Scientific Radio Corp. (Rochester, NY) model SR-210M, 10 channel SSB transceiver. Has sweep tubes in the final amp. Looks fairly good. A ding on one corner, otherwise fairly clean. Untested. $50 plus shipping/packing takes it. I'll trade for Pre-1942 ARRL or Jones Radio Handbooks, or what have you?

73,
E. V. Sandy Blaize, W5TVW
"Boat Anchors collected, restored, repaired, traded and used!"
417 Ridgewood Drive
Metairie, LA., 70001

860 Hartley 'ECO' construction "on hold"**
*** Looking for a TRC-10 transceiver ******
*** Looking for an RAL receiver ***********

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 15:54:10 EST
From: Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: Re: low radiation receivers
Message-ID: <521a1ccd.35006274@aol.com>

In a message dated 98-03-06 11:23:57 EST, ab@vuse.vanderbilt.edu writes:

> I agree that it is not related to the sinking of convoy ships in WW2,
> but the book "Spycatcher" describes in detail the counter-espionage
> effort of the British in the 50's and 60's, which were based strongly
> on detection of receiver activity. Most of this was at lower
> frequencies and ground level, single-carrier signals. At least by
> the description, the strategy was effective.

---you know, i'm ready & willing to be rescued from my ignorance on this,
but i don't understand how this could be done. were our antennas and
receivers so much worse than the government's, that we didn't hear
receiver signals all over the HF bands? i had some *big* aerials in the
late tube era, and i sure don't recall that you could encounter masses
of carriers offset from the popular bands by 455 or 3035 or whatever. super
lownoise receivers wouldn't do magic either, there's an ambient noise level.
now if you knew one certain house was likely to have an HF receiver going,
you could park a van maybe what, across the street, or maybe half a block
away and hope to maybe pick up the receiver.
poor silly me, but i am thinking not all accounts are accurate in all parts,
and that there is such a thing as 'disinformation'.
hue

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 20:58:00 +0000
From: Sandy W5TVW <ebjr@worldnet.att.net>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com, glowbugs@piobaire.mines.uidaho.edu
Subject: 1750 meters again...
Message-ID: <19980306205758.AAA10071@LOCALNAME>

On 5 Mar 98 at 15:57, EWoodman wrote:

> Absolutely correct. I have our book of New England Carrier Frequencies open in
> front of me right now. (I'm in the substation engineering dept. of an
> electric utility) We use 150, 162, 173, 173.5, 188, and 190khz as well as a
> few others. The first reaction of one of our protection and control engineers
> (also a ham) is that it could definitely be a problem. I'm by no means an
> expert on this subject but I guess I wouldn't get my hopes up, especially for
> anything more that a very minute amount of power output.
>

> 73   Eric   KA1YRV

Seems to me that the engineers at the utility should be able to calculate what field strength (in uv/meter) would disrupt the carrier current signals on their lines. Also they should be able to determine what power radiated by a given antenna (a 50 footer in this case, probably a vertically polarized radiator) it would take to produce this field strength at a given distance away. I have a feeling they just got alarmed without actually working out the problem on a "what if" basis. Unless the signals on the transmission line are very feeble, or the receivers for them very broad and unselective and very sensitive, it would take a pretty stiff potent signal to disrupt things.

Also I'd ask: what happens to the control signals on the lines during a thunderstorm? I'm sure lightning activity generates lots greater field strengths than we hams would canjure up! I have a friend who is an ex-transmission lines engineer with Entergy Corp. who I'll query about that.

If we *are* going to get that spectrum allocated for amateur use, hopefully with at least a 100 watt power limit, we need to arm ourselves with some good data to counteract whatever B.S. the power companies are likely to throw out to prevent the allocation from taking place.

73,
E. V. Sandy Blaize, W5TVW
"Boat Anchors collected, restored, repaired, traded and used!"
417 Ridgewood Drive
Metairie, LA., 70001

860 Hartley 'ECO' construction "on hold"**
*** Looking for a TRC-10 transceiver ******
*** Looking for an RAL receiver ***********

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 16:01:10 EST
From: Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: Re: low radiation receivers
Message-ID: <6d68684f.35006419@aol.com>

In a message dated 98-03-06 07:30:32 EST, AAFRadio@erols.com writes:

> It sort of falls apart when you look at some of the airborne
> ELINT receivers of the era, like the Halli AN/ARR-5 and AN/ARR-7. I
> think they were also occasionally used aboard some ships due to their
> compact designs - subs come to mind.

---just curious: any support for this notion? i haven't seen these faces in
the sub photos i have seen, which was of course a limited sampling.
what i remember there in terms of search-receivers was that SPR-1.
hue

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 16:17:13 EST
From: Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
To: boatanchors@sco.theporch.com
Cc: WSNO19@aol.com
Subject: Re: low radiation receivers
Message-ID: <3986d655.350067ea@aol.com>

In a message dated 98-03-06 16:02:15 EST,
michaels@kc2kj.k2nesoft.com writes:

> In England, during the 50's and 60's the post office, where you HAD to buy
> receiving licenses for you kitchen radio and tele, actually had vans that
> cruised around neighborhoods listening for the teltale signals of superhets
> listening to BBC, Radio Luxemburg, etc.

---anyone comment on this?
i had read this in connection *with TV reception*, *not* radio.
if i pass someone's house, and they happen to be listening to
BBC1, or is it Luxemburg1, or, or, or, where do i start to
listen?
hue

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 14:10:34 -0800
From: Scott Robinson <spr@earthlink.net>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: [Fwd: low radiation receivers]
Message-ID: <3500745A.4BCF27AC@earthlink.net>

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.
--------------64F6B0C30B99573584B5CD92
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

so THAT'S why all those European receivers have no RF stage-it's
so the 'van' can find you more easily...

--
Scott Robinson
spr@earthlink.net

Junque is GOOD for you!

```
--------------64F6B0C30B99573584B5CD92
Content-Type: message/rfc822
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
Content-Disposition: inline

Received: from sco.theporch.com (sco.theporch.com [207.234.31.38])
     by finland.it.earthlink.net (8.8.7/8.8.5) with ESMTP id NAA17705;
     Fri, 6 Mar 1998 13:21:30 -0800 (PST)
Received: from sco.theporch.com (localhost [127.0.0.1])
     by sco.theporch.com (8.9.0.Alpha2/SCO-5.0.4-RBL) with SMTP id PAA19744;
     Fri, 6 Mar 1998 15:19:17 -0600 (CST)
Received: from imo11.mx.aol.com (imo11.mx.aol.com [198.81.17.33])
     by sco.theporch.com (8.9.0.Alpha2/SCO-5.0.4-RBL) with ESMTP id PAA19689
     for <boatanchors@sco.theporch.com>; Fri, 6 Mar 1998 15:18:17 -0600 (CST)
Received: from Ho4bart@aol.com
     by imo11.mx.aol.com (IMOv13.ems) id KULVa15729;
     Fri, 6 Mar 1998 16:17:13 -0500 (EST)
Message-Id: <3986d655.350067ea@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 16:17:13 EST
Reply-To: Ho4bart@aol.com
Sender: owner-boatanchors@theporch.com
From: Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: low radiation receivers
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7bit
X-To: boatanchors@sco.theporch.com
X-Cc: WSNO19@aol.com
X-Mailer: AOL 3.0 16-bit for Windows sub 60
X-Listprocessor-Version: 8.1 -- ListProcessor(tm) by CREN
```

In a message dated 98-03-06 16:02:15 EST,
michaels@kc2kj.k2nesoft.com writes:

> In England, during the 50's and 60's the post office, where you HAD to buy
> receiving licenses for you kitchen radio and tele, actually had vans that
> cruised around neighborhoods listening for the teltale signals of superhets
> listening to BBC, Radio Luxemburg, etc.

---anyone comment on this?
i had read this in connection *with TV reception*,   *not* radio.
if i pass someone's house, and they happen to be listening to
BBC1, or is it Luxemburg1, or, or, or, where do i start to
listen?
hue

--------------64F6B0C30B99573584B5CD92--

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 17:29:16 -0500
From: Ron or Wendy Hankins <rh8421@gate.net>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: Digital Display For Any Receiver
Message-ID: <v03102806b125e244c492@[199.227.37.111]>

A Digital Frequency Display is now available that provides 10Hz accuracy with any receiver or transmitter. Only one connection is required, the VFO. Many receivers and transmitters are pre-programmed into the unit.

Ron Hankins KK4PK
555 Seminole Woods Blvd.
Geneva, FL 32732

rh8421@usa.net
rh8421@gate.net
rh8421@bitstorm.net

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 18:15:50 EST
From: Ho4bart <Ho4bart@aol.com>
To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: Re: [Fwd: low radiation receivers]
Message-ID: <a60af1c8.350083a9@aol.com>

In a message dated 98-03-06 17:10:41 EST, spr@earthlink.net writes:

> so THAT'S why all those European receivers have no RF stage-it's
> so the 'van' can find you more easily...

---yes, and that's why the TRF design was so popular in France. \:-)
hue

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 17:42:00 -0600 (CST)
From: WILLIAM HAWKINS <bill@iaxs.net>

To: boatanchors@theporch.com
Subject: WTB CV-57
Message-ID: <199803062342.RAA29813@citrus.iaxs.net>

Anybody got a CV-57 RTTY converter surplus to their needs?

Bill Hawkins bill@iaxs.net

Date: Fri, 06 Mar 1998 15:46:55 -0800
From: Larry Boyle <lbkd6wi@jps.net>
To: Boatanchors list <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: WTB Power Resistors
Message-ID: <35008AEF.1273E04A@jps.net>

I am looking for some 200 or 225 Watt resistors. I need 4 of the
same value. They can be from 35K to 75K as long as they are
the same. Any help?? Thanks Larry B. Placerville Ca.

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 14:15:40 -1000
From: Jeffrey Herman <jeffreyh@hawaii.edu>
To: Tom Norris <badger@telalink.net>
Cc: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: Hmmm. Looks like IERC is still around!
Message-ID: <Pine.GSO.3.95q.980306141423.19457D-100000@uhunix5>

On Fri, 6 Mar 1998, Tom Norris wrote:
> Speaking of which, I really need to write off to Fair and get
> a few IERC shields from them while they still have them.
> Wonder if they would make a difference in the R-392???

Has a study been conducted to determine if tube shields shorten
tube life (due to increased heating)?

Jeff KH2PZ

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 19:23:34 -0500
From: "Paul Bernhard Sr." <w2tu@email.msn.com>
To: <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Still looking for teedee

Message-ID: <0130e4923000738UPIMSSMTPUSR03@email.msn.com>

Hi Gang;
Thought I would try one more time. Does anyone out there have a tape reader (teedee) for 60 wpm use or gears for the Kliendscmidt teedee to change it for 60 wpm? Looking for a donation for the ttty setup aboard the USS The Sullivans at the Buffalo Naval Park. (tax deductible org.)
Appreciate any help.

Paul Bernhard Sr. W2TU/NNN0GNB

w2tu@msn.com

Date: Fri, 6 Mar 1998 16:38:04 -0800 (PST)
From: Ken Gordon <keng@uidaho.edu>
To: Jeffrey Herman <jeffreyh@hawaii.edu>
Cc: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: Hmmm. Looks like IERC is still around!
Message-ID: <Pine.BSF.3.95.980306163703.23279J-100000@piobaire.mines.uidaho.edu>

> > a few IERC shields from them while they still have them.
>
> Has a study been conducted to determine if tube shields shorten
> tube life (due to increased heating)?

The IERC shields PROLONG tube life. Their design drastically LOWERS the temperature of the tube envelope.

Ken W7EKB

End of BOATANCHORS Digest 1956
****